

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of newly cited Remschel. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. This rejection is respectively traversed for the following reasons. Nonetheless, in order to expedite allowance of this application, claim 1 has been amended to include what is believed to be an additional novel feature of the present invention as recited claim 2 so as to further distinguish claim 1 from the cited prior art.

A. Proposed combination does not disclose claimed invention

Claim 1, as amended, defines simultaneous display of some of the screens. The Examiner relies on Remschel as allegedly disclosing this feature at col. 16, lines 5-11 and Figures 4 and 23. However, the relied on portions of Remschel are completely silent as to simultaneous viewing of plural student screens. Instead, Remschel expressly discloses control/viewing of one student screen at a time (i.e., the “selected” student; *see* col. 15, line 35 – col. 16, line 11 which implies that *only one* student computer can be controlled and viewed at a given time with the disclosed companion software, which would lead to a “second” teacher computer to be implemented as described at col. 15, lines 46-52).

Moreover, the Examiner’s reliance on “video 1” and “video 2” shown in Figures 4 and 23 as student screens is improper. That is, “video 1” and “video 2” merely correspond to the status and settings of the educational sources (e.g., TV’s 42, 50) for the learning system in a given pattern file (*see* col. 16, lines 13-55) and do not correspond to the actual screens of the students.

The Examiner is directed to MPEP § 2143.03 under the section entitled "All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested", which sets forth the applicable standard:

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (citing *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)).

In the instant case, the pending rejection does not "establish *prima facie* obviousness of [the] claimed invention" as recited in claim 1 because the proposed combination fails the "all the claim limitations" standard required under § 103.

B. Proposed combination is improper

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is based solely on improper hindsight reasoning using only Applicants' specification as a guide to select bits and pieces of the prior art and reconstruct the claimed invention. The Examiner admits that the wireless-network of Panasik does not disclose a display unit that displays screens of some of the plural personal computers. The Examiner therefore relies on Renschel for displaying screens of some of the plural computers on a teacher's display (*see* col. 16, lines 5-11). However, Renschel is silent as to a wireless network and appears to instead be directed to a hard-wired network (*see, e.g.*, Figure 1 showing connecting cables). Accordingly, Renschel is at best cumulative to the admitted prior art described on page 1, lines 22-28 of Applicants' specification.

One of the aspects of the present invention is based on enabling a *wireless* network where computer screens can be displayed on a common wireless screen. Renschel does not suggest nor enable using the disclosed system *with wireless networks* whereas Panasik discloses only a wireless network *per se*. Only the present invention enables and uses the *combination* thereof. That is, the motivation for bridging the technical gap between the wireless network of Panasik and the alleged display of computer screens on a common screen of Renschel and the admitted prior art is derived

solely from Applicants' specification. As set forth in MPEP § 2143.01, a "statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been [obvious] because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention were *individually* known in the art is *not* sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references," *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

It is respectfully submitted that there is no *objective* evidence on the record that the prior art "suggests the desirability" of such a combination as recited in the pending claims. At best, the Examiner has attempted to show only that the elements (i.e., wireless networks and displaying screens on a common screen) of the claimed invention are *individually* known without providing a *prima facie* showing of obviousness that the *combination* of elements recited in the claims is known or suggested in the art. As discussed above, only Applicants' specification provides the motivation and enablement of the claimed combination.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

For example, the Examiner alleges that the group assignments of Remschel which are identified by colors of the student blocks (*see* col. 8, line 53 – col. 9, line 2) reads on the feature recited in claim 9 that the “wireless display is configured to output an indicator *in response to an occurrence* at a personal computer.” However, the color identification in Remschel functions merely to identify the *previously selected* student group assignments rather being *responsive to* occurrences at the computer.

Based on all the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

for  Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

#46,692

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 MEF:MWE
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: April 20, 2004